

**REMARKS**

Claims 5-21, 23 and 25-27 are rejected, and claim 24 is objected to as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-4 and 22 have been canceled. The independent claims are claims 20 and 21.

Review and reconsideration on the merits are requested.

Claims 5-21, 23 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0133256 A1 to Yoshida et al. Yoshida et al was cited as disclosing the methods of claims 20 and 21 substantially as claimed, except for the dimensions of the discreet fine protrusions formed on a part of but less than the entire surface of the dielectric layer. The Examiner considered that fine protrusions having the claimed dimensions are *inherent* in the method of Yoshida et al which is said to disclose substantially identical structures and substantially identical processes.

The rejection should be withdrawn because Yoshida et al does not disclose forming discrete fine protrusions having a specified dimension on a part of but less than the entire surface of the dielectric layer before energization as required by claims 20 and 21.

In more detail, Yoshida et al shows examples of arrangements of the external electrode 7 for electrolytic oxidative polymerization in paragraph [0052] and Figs. 3-8.

Yoshida et al also instructs in paragraph [0039] that a conductive film 300 is made by chemical oxidative formation, and that the electrolytic oxidative polymerization for forming the conductive polymer films 301 to 303 is carried out utilizing the conductivity of the film 300.

From the foregoing, it will be easily appreciated that if the conductive film 300 is formed only partially on a dielectric layer, it leads to insufficient conductive paths for forming the conductive polymer films 301 to 303. This, in turn, would result in the failure to sufficiently

form the films 301 to 303. Therefore, the conductive film 300 must be formed on the entire surface of the dielectric layer.

In contrast, taught by the present Applicant at page 12, lines 10-14 of the specification, “if the material for forming fine protrusions covers the entire surface of the dielectric layer and forms a layer, the ESR value of the capacitor produced becomes high and this is not preferred.” Thus, fine protrusions are formed *on a part of but less than* the entire surface of the dielectric layer in the present invention.

Consequently, the fine protrusions of the present invention and the conductive film 300 of Yoshida et al must be formed in shapes different from each other, and therefore fine protrusions having the claimed dimensions are not inherent in the method of Yoshida et al.

The semiconductor layer of claims 20 and 21 is made by energization *using the electric conductor as an anode*. That is, the present invention employs an electrolytic polymerization method using internal electrodes, which enables the present invention to attain the effects described at page 14, lines 20-27 of the specification. Yoshida et al, using *external* electrodes, has no disclosure from which one skilled in the art could foresee and realize the effects of the invention by employing internal electrodes.

Thus, yet another difference between the method as claimed in claims 20 and 21 and Yoshida et al is that claims 20 and 21 positively recite forming the semiconductor layer on the electric conductor by energization *using the electric conductor as an anode* (i.e., an electrolytic polymerization method employing internal electrodes), which step is not disclosed by Yoshida et al employing external electrodes for the electrolytic oxidative polymerization.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are patentable over Yoshida et al, and withdrawal of the foregoing rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of claims 5-21 and 23-27 is earnestly solicited.

In the event that the Examiner believes that it may be helpful to advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number indicated below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Abraham J. Rosner  
Registration No. 33,276

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 8, 2010